



# United States Department of the Interior



FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE  
Klamath River Fish and Wildlife Office  
P. O. Box 1006  
Yreka, CA 96097-1006  
(916) 842-5763  
FAX (916) 842-4517

December 7, 1995

## Memorandum

TO: Klamath Fishery Task Force and Technical Work Group Members

FROM: Project Leader, Klamath River FWO  
Yreka, California

SUBJECT: Minutes of the Klamath Task Force meeting in Brookings OR,  
October 26-27, 1995.

Enclosed are the draft minutes from the Klamath Task Force meeting in Brookings, Oregon, October 26-27, 1995. Please review these draft minutes and get back to us with your comments by December 28, 1995.

Ronald A. Iverson

cc: Sharon Campbell, NBS  
John Bartholow, NBS  
Jerry Grover, R1  
Dale Hall, ARD  
Steve Lewis, ERO  
Bruce Halstead, CCFWO  
Dave Zepponi, KBWU  
Randy Brown, USFWS

Attachment (1)

NOV 8 1995  
FBI

Draft Minutes  
Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force  
October 26-27, 1995  
Brookings, OR

1. Convene meeting

Chairman Jerry Grover called the meeting to order and welcomed TF members as well as the public. A quorum was present (Attachment 1).

2. Adoption of Agenda and Past Minutes

A motion was passed to adopt the Agenda (Attachment 2) with the addition of item 34, requested by Glenn Spain. Action on the adoption of Minutes was deferred until the next Task Force (TF) meeting. A glossary of acronyms used in the present and previous TF minutes are included with the handout summary (Attachment 3).

Comment:

Dutra: I strongly object to waiting so long for the meeting minutes to come out.

3. Review of last meeting/subsequent correspondence (Hamilton)

This item was deleted in the interest of time; Handouts A through C were provided in the mail-out to TF members. There were no questions.

4. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Jim Bryant)

A. Status of lake levels, flows, and forecast.

Bryant provided Handout D.

Questions:

Q. When you say the 'end of the year', you are referring to the end of the water year or the end of the calendar year?

A. We have to consider through January. There is no reason to believe we won't make Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) minimums.

Q. It would be helpful if you put in your Table average discharge. Can you do this in the future?

A. Yes.

Q. How did you project the values in the first page? On the lower part of the Table?

A. The last months' inflow figures are based on 70 percent of average.

Q. Where did we end up with precipitation?

A. 140 percent of average; we were never in flood conditions.

Q. Inflow is greater than projected, yet lake elevations are lower than projected with less Ag use and greater precipitation. Why?

A. We had to have space/slack for flood conditions. We just followed the rule curve. A couple of tenths of foot of storage is not enough to protect yourself for a storm event.

Q. What is the Acre Feet (AF) correlation with FERC mins for the year?

A. The bar graph (entitled Iron Gate Flow) after mid April is the FERC schedule.

Q. What AF will be used for winter irrigation?

A. For the next two weeks, about 34k AF. This won't show up here; the water would show up in March and April.

Q. Why isn't it accounted for?

A. There is no way to measure it; it will show up in the next water year.

Q. So those users are getting water from next years supply?

A. Yes. You aren't talking about very much water.

B. Brief Report on Status of Long Term Klamath Project Operation Plan (KPOP)

Bryant: I see the same faces here as at KPOP. We are developing a schedule for the meeting next Monday in Yreka. There will be two technical papers for review. You should have the next technical paper for review before the next meeting. From now we will have the technical meeting before the policy meeting. We have a lot of work to do to get it on board by March. We have to have a water budget in place by then to have predictability for irrigators.

Q. Are the biological criteria and water availability criteria still on track to be available by November?

A. I'm not the one to ask. Ask the consultants or we will give you an answer by next meeting.

Q. Can you put the TF on the mailing list?

A. I will pass the request on to Gary Baker.

### Public comment

Dan Gale: Iron Gate Dam (IGD) flows have been at the minimums for the better part of the year, yet in 1995 we had a lot of water. Why? Are these flows minimums or maximums?

Bryant: The FERC license article addressed the flow schedule. We'll meet FERC minimums for the rest of the year. We did address this in our technical review one year ago.

Gale: So until KPOP is completed, this is what we'll get?

Bryant: This will be determined as the result of the KPOP technical paper.

Gale: I'm still not clear why, with all the inflows, we didn't have more.

Bryant: This was not a normal water year, it was only 95 percent of normal.

Gale: It seems close enough.

Bryant: We are meeting the FERC schedule. We visited this subject in the technical review last spring.

Jon Bartholow: I am here to observe. The point made on FERC minimums is a good one. The FERC flow schedule has been described as a minimum but is used as target. When you review criteria, you should consider this. We need to think of what the consequences are of targeting FERC minimums.

### 5. NBS Jurisdictional Analysis (Campbell)

Sharon Campbell explained her role and the role of NBS in completing this analysis as part of the Phase I flow study scoping. The Department of Interior (DOI) Solicitor's office has not finished their review of this draft.

### 6. Task Force Discussion

Kucera: What is the nature of review?

Campbell: It is an assessment of various authorities regarding water quantity and quality in the Klamath Basin. The analysis describes the cast of characters involved in resource use and management. It reviews the original BOR enabling legislation. The document is prepared by Dr. Lamb and Sharon Klahn. The limits to the geographic boundaries of analysis are clearly stated. The legal basis for the Klamath Compact, FERC license articles, etc. will all be summarized in this one document. However, the Solicitor's office must review this draft prior to release.

Grover: Is it reasonable to expect it by next TF meeting?

Campbell: Yes.

Grover: Is there any reason why the TF should not consider moving ahead with plan for flow studies in the absence of the completed analysis?

Campbell: No.

Kucera: Will this include just federal agencies?

Campbell: No, it will be all levels of government.

Franklin: Dr. Lamb's study is a platform from which to proceed to have flow study planning. This is the first step in my IFIM training. There may be other players whom we don't have on the team at the moment. We don't have the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) here, an obvious player. What is wrong with proceeding without the jurisdictional analysis?

Campbell: It will be awhile before we have this for the TF; that doesn't preclude the TWG from having the information sooner.

Dutra: Here's another case where workers have information, but not the bosses. I'm asking at this date that the TF get the document ahead of time, not like the minutes, at the last instant.

#### 7. Public Comment

None

**\*\*Motion\*\***(Spain) I propose a letter from the TF requesting that Solicitor's office fast track the review of NBS' jurisdictional analysis.

**\*\*Second\*\***(Webster)

#### Discussion

Kucera: Is there danger of NBS discontinuing funding? What is their future?

Campbell: We will go to USGS and have a new name. We will probably take a five percent reduction over FY95 levels. We are forming committees to look at the merger. We don't really know when it will happen.

Webster: What is the process for the Solicitor's opinion?

Grover: It should be their opinion, only.

Spain: We will have to have this report. At a minimum, the TF needs to say this is important and request that the Solicitor's office get on with it.

**\*\*Motion Passes**

#### 8. Flow Study Direction (Grover) and Technical Work Group (TWG) Recommendations for Instream Flow Study (Bienz)

Bienz: In review (refer to Handouts E, F, and G), the TF approved the TWG to work with the NBS on flow scoping studies, however, the TF did not formally accept recommendations from TWG and NBS. At the June 20-21 meeting we also made recommendations regarding studies to be funded in FY96 (Enclosure 1, Handout G) and the dollars to be spent for flow studies. Now we need to focus on TWG coming back to TF for spending the remaining \$92,128 for flow studies. The questions before the TF are very complicated. No less complicated are the biological questions. Flow studies up to now have focussed an amount and quality of water. We need to know what the questions are for fish habitat.

The TWG wants to recommend that \$50k be devoted to the development of an NBS flow quantity model.

Dutra: We need a clear understanding of what we are studying and where the study will take place.

Bienz: The NBS water quantity study will model water quantity between Keno and Seiad gage. The water quality model goes to the mouth.

Dutra: I'm concerned about duplication of studies above IGD by all the entities spending money.

Bienz: The TWG has had two meetings where PPL and BOR have set in. The BOR representative is Chair of Hydrological Analysis subcommittee (Mark Beuttner). We have brought other agencies with us who have authority for water management. We are making sure we are doing only work directed by the TF, yet coordinating with other entities. We have moved upstream from IGD to ensure that this study addresses the hydrology from a basin perspective necessary to restore natural anadromous habitat.

Dutra: Back to the intent of TF in the Klamath Act, it directs us to focus just from IGD downstream. In light of this, and without the jurisdictional analysis, we should just focus on IGD down.

Grover: One of the first components of Klamath Act (Act) was to define the Conservation Area. It was done with understanding that what goes on upstream affects downstream {see the May 11, 1990, Solicitor's opinion regarding the geographical limitations of the Conservation Area in the Minutes from the June 26-27, 1990 TF meeting}.

Dutra: Funding for upstream should be done by upstream agencies. If the TF does it, it will let them off the hook.

Bienz: I agree, that's why we're going to go upstream for funding support. We all have a part to play here. It will take \$150k to do this analysis. The TWG recommends we do one third, \$50k. In this way, we would ante up.

Spain: For clarification, are you proposing from Keno to the mouth?

Campbell: It is currently recommended that we do from Keno to the Seiad gage and, if funds are available, to the Salmon River.

Bienz: We have already recommended funding of gages (see FY96 workplan). So in some ways, we are already extending downstream.

Kucera: Would the Upper Basin Amendment (UBA) extend jurisdiction of the TF upstream?

Hillman: This TF had lot of discussion on Conservation Area in previous meetings. We discussed this issue thoroughly and sought the Solicitor's opinion. The UBA would be to fill in an obvious gap.

Webster: Are there any commitments from other entities to fund the remaining \$100k?

Bienz: There is interest by both BOR and PPL.

Bryant: BOR is committed to support the hydrologic model up to \$50k. We might be doing this through a combination of dollars and people. We have discussed this possibility with NBS. We want to be together on this as we move down the road.

Grover: We would not be buying a pig in the poke, here. The dimensions of the water quantity study have been well developed.

Zepponi: Will the \$50k be charged to project?

Bryant: Yes, it comes out of the appropriation. \$50k will be contributed by BOR to the study. This contribution may be in dollars or "in kind". Money will be charged against the Klamath Project construction accounts and ultimately be repaid with net lease revenues generated by the Tule Lake lease areas within the Tule Lake Wildlife Refuge.

Bienz: When we talk about water quality, the TWG has also made recommendations for UC Davis extending their studies and the DO/temperature monitoring for this Keno to Seiad reach. This would come out of the \$92,128 and would work in concert with the water quantity model.

The water quantity modeling, the thermal refugia study, and recommendations for fluvial geomorphology studies as well. All of these components are necessary to quantify habitat for anadromous fish in the TWG's opinion. These TWG elements are probably beyond what is provided in KPOP. For, example KPOP may only go to IGD, so these recommendations would extend the study to where we needed it. Proposals for funding for these extras would come back at future date to TF.

Kucera: I still have reservations about some of the statements made in Dr. Orlob's proposal; they have a political tone and not a technical one. I will leave it at that.

Grover: What's referred to here for the \$50k is the water quantity model. We also have the commitment from BOR for \$50k, so we would have 2/3 of it.

Dutra: The \$150k cost is for this year, but I gather there would be \$150k for next year?

Bienz: Yes. Then the water quantity study will be completed.

Hillman: So the question is: would the TF ante up \$50k for this year only? Would that hold true for next year as well?

Bienz: The process would be as it always has been; the TF would have to approve the other \$50k for next year, unless we could get someone else to come onboard and pick this up.

Dutra: So you don't anticipate it being \$150k next year for us? Will NBS and BOR do their share next year?

Bienz: They haven't indicated they are not going to do this. I would also go back to the \$500k that the TF Chair has talked about on various times as being available for this work. Support for the study has been discussed at several levels by various agencies.

Hillman: Is NBS one of the various agencies and is NBS committed to do this through MOU? Is it fair to assume that NBS will be here if we sign it?

Campbell: The intent of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is to help ensure NBS involvement and financial resources to follow through on commitment.

Grover: Regardless of whey end up, NBS will still be under the Secretary of Interior to our benefit.

Hillman: So this MOU is an important end to tie up.

Grover: We're hung up on the first recommendation, does the TWG have other recommendations?

Bienz: The TWG's second recommendation is for a pilot study to look at coldwater refugial habitats. This has been done on other river systems. This would use correlations between cool water and radio tracked adult fall chinook salmon to identify critical refugial areas. We would like to spend \$21,351 of FY96 dollars on the pilot study. The following year we would evaluate whether we want to continue with this line of thinking and propose to do a full blown study to show where cold water refugia are.

Our third recommendation is that the TF would provide additional money to UC Davis water quality study which would extend the presently funded study upstream to Keno and possibly to the Shasta River. This would be an expansion of the water temperature and DO modules. (There was no handout for this).

#### Questions:

Webster: Would this complete the study by the University?



Bienz: No. They would require monies in 1997 (\$35,245) and 1998 (\$16,535). The total would be about \$75k for those three years. The study may well be finished before this based on the efforts of NBS and others. These efforts were proposed independently, we are now trying to make sure that we're not doing what Clancy Dutra was talking about earlier, funding the same proposal twice. We are making sure these studies conform.

Dutra: On the UCDavis proposal, didn't we fund this before?

Bienz: The original study (not the expansion) was approved at the last TF meeting.

Bybee: What was the reach on the refugial study?

Bienz: For the overall study, from the mouth to IGD; this videography is beyond the scope of this year's study. However, from the pilot study this year we will learn where key locations are.

Grover: Did the TWG make any recommendations beyond the \$92k?

Bienz: No. We have had discussion but did not make any recommendations. We ran out of money so we did not go any further.

Barnes: What is USGS long term commitment to flow studies?

Bienz: We know we have commitment by BOR to make sure essential gages are there. There is also a commitment by the USFS. We're trying to make sure we all come together on that.

Barnes: I would like to talk specifically about the Salmon River.

Bienz: The TWG talked about the Salmon River gage and the importance of continuing this gage. There are three options to maintaining that gage and I can go into them if you wish.

Barnes: USFS will continue the gage through this October, then there is a capital investment required. The USFS would be willing to share that cost.

Iverson: The problem with maintaining gages is not really lack of the USGS funding, its the loss of the matching funds from the State. That is really what we're making up. By passing it through the State Department of Water Resources, it constitutes the non-federal match and allows the USGS to continue operating the gages.

Barnes: There is still no assurance of funding for the Salmon gage.

Bienz: The BOR has committed to funding two more gages in the Klamath for four more years. The Salmon could be one of those gages. I've been looking at ways to do this. There is \$16k cost to reinstall the anchor and maintain the gage. There are a variety of options that would allow for the TF to coordinate with the BOR and USFS to make this come together. If we are required to, we can do that.

Barnes: There remains a question of long-term commitment that involves the entire basin.

Bienz: This is an example of how we are trying to make sure that the technical information needed is available. It is a difficult time.

Campbell: On the MOU, I am passing out a modified version (Handout H; not same as Sept 20 version).

Hillman: What are the changes?

Campbell: There are slight changes in reference terms as agreed to at the last TWG meeting. The reference to the water quantity model is changed to system analysis model. The figure attached is also the one generated at the TWG meeting.

The MOU will formalize interaction between the TWG and NBS. This will be a legal contract of sorts to grandfather in our work regardless of whether we are transferred to another agency or not. This can be used to protect our involvement. It is also central to the issue because a lot of the model components will be provided with NBS resources. They are spelled out at the end of the document. We are asking that the TF approve signing the MOU today.

Dutra: In paragraph 6c, you state that nothing in this MOU will obligate the NBS to present or future expenditure of funds. I think that this should be worded to protect both sides. There should be a c.1 and c.2 which would also say that nothing here obligates the TF to present or future expenditures either.

Campbell: I see what you mean, let me make the change right now.

Kucera: Is there a problem with the working relationship between NBS and TF?

Campbell: No, there is a good working relationship.

Kucera: Is this a necessary step? I would think that if the Interior Secretary has made a commitment to \$500k to the Klamath Basin area, I would think that he would make it a priority to keep the people involved that have been involved. I have some real reservations about signing a legal contract before we have had time to review it.

Campbell: I am not asking anyone to sign this before they've had a chance to review it. All I'm asking for is for the TF to indicate they are willing to enter into this today. Then it will be distributed for review and comment.

Grover: We have a couple of items here: one is that we have to agree we're going to do the flow study in concept; second is the business of the MOU in doing this.

Campbell: We are trying to grandfather our commitment so that if transferred to another agency, we can continue to work. This MOU will probably protect you more than the government, but it will protect us from having another group

within the new agency we are transferred to from interfering with our work on the Klamath. So I am asking you to state support for working with NBS. That is the primary purpose of MOU. The secondary purpose of the MOU is it finalizes the relationship with NBS. It's spells out what NBS expects from the TF and what the TF can expect from NBS.

Grover: I ask that you submit any written comments to KRFWO on this MOU (by November 27, 1995).

#### 8c. Flow Study Direction

Bienz: The diagram (also Handout H) is our attempt to clarify flow study direction to the TF.

Campbell: This diagram represents the current state; it does not mean that it will not change.

Grover: Is the area on the diagram in bold marked system analysis model what this MOU is addressing?

Bienz: Yes. We really are focussing on components. At this time, what is in the box is what the TWG recommends the TF focus on. We respect the KPOP process and feel it is a part of the complete analysis. We are trying to work this in so there is no duplication of efforts. The work is being shared by BOR and NBS; others are using this information. Micro habitat is in the box right now, but they are small components now. We have commitments from the NBS, like the micro-habitat work that is on going right now, funded at \$15k in this FY. This is our recommendation.

Campbell: We are committed to making all these modules work together as tools for water management. This is the research and development challenge that we want to work with the TF on over the next few years.

#### 8d. TWG role in KPOP.

Bienz: In KPOP there will be the development of Technical memoranda. Those memos will address a variety issues from water availability, water use systems operations, biological criteria, and others (six total). They will be reviewed by each TWG member as an individual. The TWG will work with the development of these memoranda and has made a decision to convene in January. We will have recommendations back to the TF by your next meeting.

Grover: What is nature of review?

Bienz: To review information, make a recommendation as to the appropriateness of the information, and to help direct Phase II flow studies. Our meeting is scheduled to Jan 18-19, 1996 in Redding.

#### 9. Task Force Discussion

Dutra: The process is what I'm grasping for. What are the off ramps? What if we can't agree with comments? How do we rewrite the MOU as a group?

Campbell: We need comments on the MOU soon (later specified by November 27, 1995).

Grover: If we have substantial key differences that divide this TF on direction or content or the makeup of the MOU, this is the right time to discuss them.

Rode: That is the point, this MOU has already had one level of scrutiny. I would like to see it resolved at this TF meeting.

Hillman: This has already been in our packet for review. The changes discussed here have not been substantive. Why approve tentatively? Lets approve this MOU before we leave.

Grover: Klamath County, can you express your concerns?

Kucera: I can express the concerns that Mr. Solem has expressed to me. What he sees happening here is nothing more than a job security measure. He is concerned that if NBS is disbanded, that the TF will be bound to pick up the tab and restoration projects will suffer as a result.

Hillman: If someone pulls out of the agreement then the agreement is no longer.

Rode: The job security perception is not germane. This MOU will help get a product that we want. That should be the issue of consideration.

Kucera: We would like more focus on downstream projects; can I defer to Mr. Zepponi?

Dave Zepponi: The concern is on the general direction of the science program without knowing what the cost is over the long haul. This is an agreement of convenience for NBS so we don't lose them, but do we accept the projects? We're not convinced that the direction of the TWG and the science program is appropriate. We need better information of where this is headed and to have a clear understanding of what it will cost us. It's not prudent to having a contract without seeing where its going. It's not stalling the process, we just want to understand better. Duplication is another concern, KPOP for example. To have the TF stay outside the KPOP until the very end is problematic.

Grover: We are buying into \$150k for the next two years divided up between three entities to work on the water quantity model. Is that not your understanding?

Hillman: There are no TF commitments to spend TF dollars in this document. We have some momentum for first time ever on a flow study. The MOU is to maintain that momentum.

Rode: We have a \$200k commitment on the part of NBS. I don't understand the thought here.

Zepponi: I disagree, we need to examine taxpayer expense carefully. We want to know what we're committing to.

Franklin: I understand that it's awkward when Klamath County had no representative at the last TWG meeting. Keith Marine has participated in the past and don't know why he didn't go. Benefits to anadromous fish are of prime concern to all here. My impressions from the meetings is that NBS may disappear if they do not have this agreement. I really want to see this MOU signed. We need their expertise.

Hillman: I am asking that we separate the two issues. This way one won't drag the other down. Then Klamath County can check with your constituency and defer until tomorrow your flow study recommendations.

Dutra: They are interrelated, let's move them both off until tomorrow.

Spain: Will NBS do the work without an MOU?

Campbell: No. We are at a point now that we need to have a firm indication of support. It's break or make time.

Bartholow(NBS): This is not job security. It is wise insurance. NBS wants to know if you are interested in pursuing the same direction NBS and the TWG have laid out as a way to go. That's where we want to apply our expertise. If TF does not want to go this route, we will find other partners.

Webster: The MOU is the way to get the job done that everyone wants.

Grover: Are there other discussion items related to this?

#### 10. Public Comment

Gary Black (Siskiyou RCD): Concerning the flow studies, the Siskiyou RCD receives and uses some of the extras (data) from these studies. I don't see how the Salmon River can work without a gage station. We use the temperature data and can provide our to NBS in return. NBS needs to come to CRMPs and the RCD's to explain their intent. I invite you to come and explain your work at the ground level.

Bruce Halstead (USFWS): It's several years before FERC relicensing; its certain that FERC will make a decision on flows on the basis of a study, perhaps this one we are going to do. We need their involvement in this effort.

On thermal refugia, it is just as important to look at juvenile fish needs, especially when you consider the potential listing of coho and steelhead.

Frank Shrier (PPL): Related to the last comment and whether PPL is interested in the flow modeling proposed, we are having a meeting tomorrow on this subject. Our interest has peaked because of NBS. We see them as a nonbiased participant, a good scientific entity, and we are interested in their involvement.

Dave Zepponi (KBWU): I ask of TF that we get some of this information to Dave Vogel (Minutes from the October 10-11, 1995, meeting in Yreka; these Minutes were mailed to all TWG members on October 16, 1995 (Rob Beachler, Pers. Comm)). For the record we have three issues: 1) the importance of the projects being proposed to anadromous fisheries, 2) the jurisdictional question (NBS report), and 3) costs. This is becoming a huge bill back to KBWU. That is one of the reasons why I come to these meetings; to make sure our money is being spent appropriately. I would like to ask Craig to recap what's proposed.

Bienz: Page 14 of the TWG minutes (above) will have that info (Handout I).

Zepponi: We need to have cumulative costs of studies and their purpose, that would be very useful to me; please attach some dollar values to the diagram you had. We need to do cumulative impacts to the treasury as well as fish. Jurisdiction will be addressed in another forum; NBS' report should be circulated in draft (to the Klamath County Commissioners); there may be disagreement between agencies as to what their authorities are.

I do like to see a connection between the charge of the TF through the Act and where we are spending the money. I apologize for missing the last TWG meeting, that was the first one we've missed in awhile.

Our pockets are not that deep in the Klamath Project; maybe we need to look at other venues to support these studies. Our intention is to focus on the fish; we need to look at what is really limiting fish recovery.

The role of the TWG in KPOP is an issue, it's been a nightmare to get the administrative record. We will be reviewing the technical memos as they are produced. The TF should not wait until the end to make comments. If TF wants to comment, they should be an active participant.

Hillman: I concur, your argument has a great deal of merit. I would also like to call your attention to the fact that the reason we are having this discussion is because your representative was not at the TWG meeting. I expect a lot out of my TWG representative; you should too. I would encourage better communication. Otherwise we don't get through our agenda in an orderly fashion.

Zepponi: It would be useful to have mailings for TF and TWG sent to this office. I have asked before to have that done and it hasn't happened.

Hamilton: Will do.

Steve Lewis (ERO): This approach is going to provide the answers to the water management questions before us; the flow study is among the most important things we will be doing in the next two years. We need to have this forward motion with NBS continued. They provide good scientific information. I would hate to see NBS lost from this process because they have the expertise and they have money. No one agency can pay for it all. The flow study is critical to forming partnerships in the future.

Grover: Be prepared for a decision on the recommended flow study direction, TWG spending recommendations for remainder of FY96 money, and the MOU with NBS after lunch.

12:30            Lunch

Reconvene (Mitch Farro now present)

Chairman Grover reviewed discussions from this morning.

Grover: Do I have a motion on the TWG's recommendation?

\*\*\*Motion (Spain): I move that we accept the TWG recommendations for the water quantity model, the pilot study on cold water refugia, and increase the agreement we have with UCDavis to expand water quality work from Keno to the Siead gage.

\*\*Seconded\*\* (Webster)

Discussion:

Kucera: This motion does not include the MOU?

Grover: Correct.

Dutra: In cold water pilot study, this will lead us to an end product. What about the other two studies? Do we go to another level of study or what? Do we commit ourselves to future studies? If it cannot be made clear to me what we have at the end of this year, then we do not have consensus.

Bienz: The UCDavis proposal says these tools will quantify water quality and flow conditions in that reach and that these tools will be in the public domain and available to all parties interested in Klamath River salmon restoration, so, yes there is a product. From NBS, we have had products generated at every phase.

Campbell: There will be report at end of year, but the model will take two years to complete. It will take that long to make the model complete and provide the documentation.

Dutra: What happens if NBS's budget is cut? If it isn't a product that we can put in the file and have someone else can pick up in the future, then we have scary investment.

Campbell: The way that research progresses does not always lend itself to direct business oriented accounting. I want to be honest, the water quantity model cannot be completed in one year, nor can a final product be delivered in one year. It will require a two year effort. We are asking that you agree, in principle, to a two year course of action, that funding be provided for one year, and then on the second year, we'll have to do our best to make sure that funding is available.

Dutra: To do something that is totally usable, would it be possible to spend \$50k and have a completed product from the IGD dam to the Shasta river? And then the next year bite off another portion?

Campbell: That's your choice as a TF.

Spain: Mr. Chairman, I think we're really talking about two different things, the completion of the whole model is one thing and the written summary of the findings of the report that we are paying for can be done whenever those results are obtained. So I would be happy to modify my motion to that effect. We'll have a written product, there's no doubt about that.

Dutra: I am concerned; I have seen a lot of research go down the tubes and lots of waste in research. There's a lot of cuts being made in D.C. this year.

Campbell: It a reasonable concern. From NBS's perspective the best way to do it is to do the entire model from Keno to the mouth and through the major tributaries. The model would be built the first year, then the second year build the data file, and adjusting outputs to the right time step.

As part of the MOU, NBS commits to provide annual progress reports. So yes, a product will be there after a year, and if they cut off the money, you will be able to build on this work.

Grover: In the proposal before you today, NBS will provide annual reports summarizing their work accomplished and offering recommendations to the future activities.

Kucera: As a Klamath County representative, I've got a hard time supporting UC Davis when it puts the blame on agriculture for all the nutrient loading in the Klamath Basin. It talks also about control of water in the basin. I can't vote yes on this, my constituency would not agree and I have been instructed to vote no.

I have a question of Steve Lewis: At the last meeting you elaborated on \$1.2M or \$1.25M that had been appropriated for upper basin projects and that there has been approximately \$500K that has been re-appropriated to the USFWS. Can you elaborate on that? And if those dollars are available, to which entities?

Lewis: The Hatfield working group asked for \$2 to \$3 million to do riparian restoration. In the appropriations process we were to be given \$1.225 million for restoration in the upper basin. Hatfield had earmarked that money within the appropriations for the USFWS under what is called the Private Lands Partnership program. We don't know if this is an add-on or whole budget. There hasn't been a final mark up. We originally were told \$750k. The difference is somewhere within Interior, and may be available to you. If we can get back the \$1.225 million, I think that the Hatfield working group would entertain the opportunity to use some of those funds for maybe an instream flow analysis.

**\*\* Motion Amended\*\*** That we vote on these items singularly, as opposed to all three of them at once.



**\*\*Second accepts\*\***

**\*\* First Motion:** The TF accepts the TWG's recommendation to spend \$50k for the water quantity model in the Klamath River from Keno to Seiad.

**\*\*Motion Fails (Klamath County voted no)**

Kucera: Klamath County objects because we want to see in stream flow studies completed before the water models are developed.

Franklin: I am deeply confused by that remark, could you explain the logic?

Kucera: We want to reiterate the emphasis on completing the instream flow studies downstream: I hope you understand that I'm under direction and that I am an alternate.

**\*\*Second Motion\*\*** The TF accepts the TWG recommendation to do a pilot study on cold water refugia. The approximate amount would be \$21.4k.

Discussion

Dutra: If we take and spend little pieces, aren't we tying the hands of the TWG to come back with a motion. For instance, could we complete a portion of the flow study from the mouth upstream to wherever that may be?

Bienz: Our hands have been tied due to lack of funding. When you addressed the cold water refugial issues, the \$21k is the amount that we felt could be afforded. There are other components. We can go down the list and fund others.

**\*\*Motion passes**

**\*\* Third Motion:** The TF accept the TWG's recommendations to increase the existing contract with UC Davis dealing with water quality (the increased work would deal in the area between IGD and Keno).

Discussion:

Rode: The product proposed is something needed and is an extension of a previously funded project. Once again, the proper forum to address Klamath Counties' concerns for this is the TWG. Is there anyway to resolve this through modifying the verbiage?

Kucera: If there is scientific information backing these assertions on nutrient loading it should be cited. It makes me very uncomfortable as a representative of Klamath County to adopt this proposal as written.

Bybee: Was your proxy to vote no or abstain?

Kucera: I have been instructed to vote no. I suggest we look at alternatives and that the TF look at more in-river projects below IGD.

Rode: I think Klamath Counties' concern is that by approving this project, we will enter the introductory or background information into the record, yet we already approved the original proposal so that information is already in the record.

Spain: Would you be willing to have offending statements removed?

Caucus

Kucera: Mr. Chairman, we are at an impasse, but I will work on this tonight.

Spain: I will withdraw the motion to work through this impasse. We will caucus this evening and tomorrow and work this out.

**\*\*Second concurs**

**\*\*Motion Tabled**

#### Further Discussion

Franklin: Is there an opportunity to do the same for the water quantity proposal for \$50k?

Rode: I would like to reopen the water quantity discussion. Elements which are troubling people seem to be the geographic scope of the proposal and production of results. Reframing the proposals so it could be accomplished in one year increments may help.

Dutra: If it can be more clearly defined as to what work we are paying for with \$50k, it would help.

Grover: The Chair recognizes that the motion that was defeated earlier regarded the acceptance of the TWG's recommendation. I am detecting that there is a new effort on the table that would limit the scope geographically and more fully explain the products involved.

Franklin: Mr. Chairman, I had asked a question and I didn't get an answer. The question is, would we have an opportunity to work it out today or tomorrow or no? If no, from Klamath County, it's a moot point.

Kucera: Part of the concern is that there are a lot of water quality studies going on right now in the upper basin. If you can work from IGD down, perhaps.

Franklin: This is the water quantity study. The reason we are picking it up at Keno is that we have efforts underway down to that point.

Kucera: To be frank, I have been instructed to vote no on the Keno to Seiad proposal. It will take longer than today or tomorrow.

Rode: This geographic extent (Keno to Seiad) was based on Dale Hall's letter (Handout F) to NBS identifying this as a top priority reach. In consultation

with other entities located on the river we believed that would be the appropriate direction to take to fill in all the gaps.

\*\* Motion (Spain) Water quantity model discussion be deferred until the next TWG meeting, and that in the interim the TWG meet with Klamath County officials and other interested parties on this specific issue and to see if the project can be restructured so that we can have a successful motion.

\*\*Seconded (Farro)

#### Discussion

Farro: Was Klamath County involved in the TWG at the time these recommendations were worked out?

Rode: They were, but failed to attend the TWG meeting. This delay until the next TF meeting may result in the loss of NBS. We have been criticized for proceeding too slowly on this. We need to decide at this meeting.

\*\*Motion fails(Klamath County abstains, two votes against)

\*\* Motion\*\*(Rode) The TF approve the \$50k for water quantity model from IGD to Seiad gauge.

\*\*Seconded(Hillman)

#### Discussion

Franklin: As a hydrologist, it makes no difference; the model will use the same inputs whether from Keno or IGD.

Webster: Why not go from IGD to the mouth?

Rode: We don't have those funds. We're just being realistic.

Webster: Will the funds give us a product this year?

Rode: It is not feasible and not a part of motion.

Dutra: I was afraid of that.

Spain: (to Dutra) Are you happy with reporting requirements? All of these programs have a requirement for written work products.

Dutra: I want to see some guarantee that they will complete a portion of the model.

Spain: You need all the pieces to have a model. I support there being a written work product; this should be a requirement.

Franklin: I will vote no because it is nonsense to me as a technical person.

Hillman: I will vote no even though I seconded motion.

\*\*Motion withdrawn.

Rode: I will withdraw the motion, but I ask that we meet this evening and discuss this further.

Grover: The Chair will defer this decision until tomorrow.

12. Progress Report on Reintroduction of Anadromous Fish into Upper Basin (Shrier)

Frank Shrier presented the Handouts J and K as follow up to the recommendation from the TWG that there be an independent examination of the potential for habitat above IGD. Information was taken from two studies (Fortune et al. 1966, and Hanel and Stout, 1974; see Handout J for full reference).

Q. Where was the documentation of historical salmonid distribution from? What months were spawning fish present?

A. The information was anecdotal or from newspapers. September, October, November on average were months fish were present.

Q. The 1966 habitat characteristics, is there anything which indicates these conditions still exist?

A. Not really, that's why I'm looking forward to an IFIM study.

Q. Is there any indication that upper river chinook have any genetic material programming them to return above IGD?

A. They probably still have those genes to home above the dam.

Q. The big challenge would be transiting Klamath Lake, correct?.

A. Right, that would be a major block. The juveniles would run the gamut of predators. Would also be irrigation and power withdrawals to deal with.

Q. You said you are looking forward to IFIM?

A. Yes, IFIM would be first priority for studies.

Comment (Rode): NBS also recommended this as a priority.

Q: You made no mention of Spring chinook. They've always been assumed to have been present and historically made up the majority of the returns, so why were they left out?

A: They assumed Spring fish were written off, a lost cause.

Q: Did you get reasonable information on what run was historically?

A: It is available: Randy Brown from FWS has additional information.

Grover: Thank you, Mr. Shrier.

13. Upper Basin Amendment Final Recommendation - (Upper Basin Amendment Ad-Hoc Committee, Keith Wilkinson)

Kucera: The do pass recommendation for the draft (Handout L) was made at the last TF meeting.

14. Task Force Discussion

Franklin: If we didn't pass this today, what would be the consequences? I have some issues with this draft which would cause me to vote no now; however, I believe most of these technical issues can be worked out between now and the next meeting.

Grover: What are the nature of concerns?

Franklin: I just got my copy several days ago. My impression is that few people have been able to read it. There are a host of areas where technical clean up is required. I cannot get to the same endpoints as the author, given the data. In absence of clear opportunity to edit, I would have to vote no. I would work with the Subcommittee and look to them as to how to submit those comments.

Grover: Given the nature of the comments from Mr. Franklin, it is apparent that this will not pass. I suggest that we defer this decision until the next meeting. We need one more wack at this.

Spain: Please put your detailed comments in writing, line by line, and get out to every member of the TF. This UBA is new to me, but we've worked on this for years. I want to know where objections are and why.

Grover: There has been too much work on this to abandon it.

Spain: We need to give the ad hoc committee a commendation for a job well done.

Franklin: I will get my comments in writing to KRFWO by December 15, 1995. I will also make suggested changes rather than leave someone else to squirm about what will make me happy.

Farro: I have reservations with this document also. I know its gone through considerable revisions. What is the process from here on?

Zepponi: We're done with it. We'll get the disk copy to Hamilton at KRFWO.

15. Public Comment

None.

16. Action: TF Decision on how to proceed with Upper Basin Amendment

Grover: Get the comments on the draft UBA to Hamilton at KRFWO before December 15, 1995, along with suggested changes, then we'll work it out with the Subbasin committee. First the TF has to be comfortable with this before we can send it out to the public (see comments of Dave Zepponi below on the need for Klamath County to go back to the Commissioners for approval of the UBA).

17. Mid program review (Beachler/Hamilton)

Hamilton: The Long Range Plan (LRP) calls for a five year program review. Through 1992, Doug Alcorn/KRFWO did an preliminary evaluation of how the LRP policies and tasks (Handout M.a) have been implemented consistent with #1 below. He recommended this criterion and seven others as the basis of an evaluation of the Klamath Restoration Program:

1. Implementation of LRP policies and tasks.
2. Amount of money spent in each restoration category
3. Change in harvest (increase/decrease/no change)
- No 4. Change in adult and juvenile standing crop
- Yes 5. Change in fish habitat condition
6. Change in land management practices
7. Change in state and federal laws affecting fishery resources
8. Change in level of public knowledge of fish and habitat issues

Consistent with criterion #2, Dale Hall directed us to assess how the dollars have been spent for restoration at the February 1995 TF meeting in Eureka. KRFWO and Rob Beachler from HSU have analyzed CDFG and Klamath Act projects. A summary of project locations via GIS and pie charts showing where KRFWO dollars spent will be presented by Rob.

The remaining criteria for an evaluation need to be specified by the TF. The TF needs to endorse the remainder of Alcorn's criteria or provide others, then decide who will evaluate them. William Kier and Associates can analyze harvest and trends in returns to the Klamath basin (criteria 3 and 4) through 319(h) monies. The assessment of the remaining four criteria should be a high priority category for FY97 proposals.

Rob Beachler presented analysis he has done (Handout M.b). He asked for input from the TF as to what they want to see in a five year program review beyond the analysis he has done.

Hamilton then reiterated that Rob needs further direction from the TF in terms of what work he should continue to do.

18. TF Discussion

Barnes: What is fish protection? How do you get site specific?

Beachler: Some of these projects were give a single point even though they may have been done watershed wide.

Barnes: Comment, I question whether GIS is useful in this context. I don't see the value of GIS unless you can make it site specific.

Grover: Did the dollar amounts include matching or just federal dollars?

Hamilton: The information Rob worked with is for CDFG and TF funded projects only. If the TF wants this expanded to include USFS and BLM projects, we need to know that.

Dutra: Can we get a better reproduction of this map info?

Beachler: Yes, we also have it in tabular format. We would like to solicit the TF for more direction as to what you want in a program review.

Franklin: What's this suggestion about change in harvest? To what extent has our program changed harvest?

Hamilton: That's up to the TF to decide if you want that criteria.

Farro: One of the goals of this program is by 2006 to provide for viable commercial, sport, in-river, and Tribal fisheries.

Franklin: To what extent have we improved fisheries could be a measure of success.

Spain: We could answer whether habitat protection measures are having a real measurable return. I don't understand why Keir & Associates would be involved?

Hamilton: Because Kier's services are available (at no cost to the TF) as part of a 319(h) grant. If you don't want harvest analyzed or don't want Keir & Associates to do it, that is the direction we need to have. Keir could work on Criterion four as well. There needs to be decision whether the TF wants to go forward with the remaining five criteria.

Farro: I would like clarified what process we will use for this Midprogram review. I am assuming the public will comment back to us as to the effectiveness of our program and with suggestions for mid course changes to improve what we're doing.

Hamilton: I do not disagree, but the TF needs to put some criteria out there, if only as a strawman, to get some feedback. If the criteria were developed, they can be put out before the public, who will let us know if they are on the right track.

Franklin: I don't see number four as being useful, give the natural variability of populations. The TF should be using habitat measures as a criterion rather than fish counts.

Grover: Have these criteria been accepted by the TF?

Hamilton: No, the TF needs to OK these criteria or provide others.

Rode: We should concentrate on criterion five; the situation on three or four is too complex and we don't have the resources to get good info on three or four.

Bienz: I'd like to echo that but add six and eight as well. As Jerry Barnes said, there have been a lot of changes in land management. On number eight, we could work with Dr. Lamb and others at NBS.

Spain: Harvest data is available from NMFS; I don't think anyone has compiled it. The problem is relating it to what we have done.

Bybee: On number four, these data are going to be very important to NMFS as we consider listing of proposed species.

Franklin: Wouldn't it be informative to get another perspective on our successes? In other efforts to evaluate programs such as the Trinity, there is a great tendency to recollect what has worked. There is a tendency to not dwell on failures, yet that is part of the record and its very healthy thing to be informed of. It's interesting to look at where the money was spent, but we really need to see where we have met our objectives. There's a bunch of actions called for in the long range plan where we haven't done anything (see Doug Alcorn's report, Handout M.a) and we need to be reminded of those areas. It would be appropriate to the taxpayers who have paid for it. If there is anything worth doing, this is it.

Farro: I would like to see what percentage of the money was allocated to entities represented on the TF. We need an honest look at it. I'm in the dark as to what criterion five will tell us; in the last five years we've had fluctuations in flows that will override measurable change in habitat. Someone will have to clarify this. On number eight, the public's understanding of these issues is something which will really be telltale.

Hamilton: Keir and Associates may be able to examine existing data sets with KRIS to look further at criterion five, that's a suggestion. If the TF can provide further direction to Rob on criterion two, it would be very helpful.

Grover: The question at hand is where do we go from here. We also need to ask who will do it. There are some things KRFWO can arrange for, but they have limited staff and resources also. I don't know how many grad students there are out there to work on this.

Bienz: One recommendation would be that we would look at land management and also look at fish habitat conditions in a comprehensive way. We could do this through FY97 solicitations or through KRFWO and HSU. We should include the USFS.

Grover: The focal point of the program review is what influence have our TF decisions and dollars had on meeting the directive to develop and implement a program to restore fish in the Klamath River.

Kucera: What is the time line for completion? Do you have one in mind?



Grover: It is ongoing, but it would be something we would fund and expect to be accomplished in FY97.

Hamilton: It sound like there is consensus on Rob continuing to work on criterion 2. Am I correct?

Franklin: How will assessment of the BLM and USFS dollars spent help us evaluate our program?

Grover: There are two components to our program: the federal dollars through FWS and the non-federal dollars. The non federal contribution is supposed to be a match, predominantly through California's's contribution from CDFG and DWR.

Hamilton: We need to report on that.

Grover: On behalf of the TF in furthering the objectives of the LRP.

Rode: We want the total picture of funding. We want to see what is complementing our program and what's been done in the entire watershed.

Grover: Not to do their objectives, but to do LRP objectives.

Franklin: That could be informative in terms of how we share programs, but how would it be that Rob could judge if it met our objectives?

Hamilton: Doug Alcorn's report shows just the bucks that have been spent for all agencies up through FY92; do you want to update this to FY96?

Franklin: This may not be TF work, it may better to put a committee to work on this.

Hamilton: What I hoped to get out of this discussion is TF general direction on where to go; what the program evaluation criteria should be, then go back to the TWG to work out the nuts and bolts of how to evaluate based upon that TF direction. Perhaps we could take the proposals to do this and incorporate them into Jud Ellinwood's revised RFP. If the TF can agree on criteria, and prioritize them, then the TWG is the next place to go with it.

Dutra: We should keep separate the dollars that were allocated through this program, but track leveraged dollars as well through RCDs, CRMPs, CDFG, etc. because they are worth reporting on. In these situations, the TF got the ball rolling. We can then see clearly that we get big projects done for little investment.

Farro: It's important to show in an evaluation how much money for restoration has been leveraged. Especially in a tight fiscal situation.

Dutra: I recommend this be put on the next agenda as an ongoing subject.

Spain: I agree. We need that information. We need to know that we were effective at leveraging.

Hamilton: Before you all go today, can you let Rob Beachler know if he is on the right track?

Franklin: Rob, one of the questions is: Would we like you to compile numbers on what's been spent. How much does that cost us?

Beachler: If we start plowing through all USFS and BLM files, it can take up all our time.

Spain: How doable is just continuing this analysis using just the TF funded projects through the eight year period, then also breaking out what has been leveraged as a result of TF projects?

Beachler: That would take a little bit of time; a lot of it's done, or already there.

Spain: We need that information. If we can show that we leverage 2:1 or 3:1, it would be very useful and fairly painless to do.

#### 19. Public Comment

Gary Black (Siskiyou RCD): KRIS would be a good way to do long term evaluations of our projects.

Bruce Halstead (USFWS) : On leveraging, I'm not so sure you can get that from the project files. For example, last year we had BOR funding for screw traps but this would not show up. Blue Creek is another example. This won't show up on project proposals. There are other examples out there.

Dave Zepponi (KBWU): Its a very good idea to look hard look at the TF and how the money has been spent. I appreciate what's been done on behalf TF by Rob. I have had very bad experience with corporate evaluation. The key to leverage is what your driver is; you need to take a hard look at. Glad to hear that you are concerned with the fox guarding the henhouse. To have the person who wrote the plan do some of the analysis of whether the Klamath plan is effective will not cut the mustard in an audit review. We need to be very aware of the need for objectivity. You need to have someone come in from out of the basin who is familiar these procedures.

We really need to know where the dollars are going and how they are spent. Would like to see efficiency examined. We need to take a hard look at administration since this is such a big part of the budget. In the Act there are requirements, we need to look at whether they are being met. One of those is employment (Native Americans, unemployed commercial fishermen), it is the law and you need to hold yourselves accountable to this. As far as criteria, it is dangerous as to have the people being evaluated be the ones to develop the criteria. I would recommend an RFP go out saying we need to be evaluated and get responses back from consultants and universities.

There are going to be two primary criteria, cost effectiveness and performance (whether you are doing the things the Act states you must do and whether you are doing the things the LRP asks you to do). It's important to be

accountable to both sides, fiscally and performance-wise. We can debate criteria for a long time what's important or what's not. We need to have someone come in and tell us these are important and here's why. Then we need to limit the time because we can't spend all our budget on evaluation. The right way to look at this is as a way to help improve the performance of whomever you are evaluating.

Franklin: What might such a proposal cost?

Zepponi: In the neighborhood of \$150-200k. You could get someone for in the \$20-50k range, perhaps a competent university outside of our area. There are two components: biological and business. When selecting your consultants you need to look at both.

#### 20. Action: TF Decision on how, or if, to proceed with Mid-Program Review

Farro: We need to look at non-federal matches as defined in the Act, not so much what these agencies have spent on their own programs as what the cost share has been (leverage provided). For example, I know there was a lot of dollars from Fruit Grower's and other landowners spent in French Creek. Let's narrow our criteria/scope down so we provide direction to whoever does this. If there's concurrence with me on this direction for Mr. Beachler, let's hear it.

Rode: On the California side, there is supposed to be a non-federal match by CDFG and California Department of Water Resources, then in Oregon there are supposed to be a non-federal match by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW). In reality, however CDFG has been the only one that has made the commitment over the years.

Dutra: On the proposals, matching contributions are discussed on the budget pages. These matches should be acknowledged.

Franklin: One of the problems in re-authorizing the Trinity Program is proving what good the program is doing. I see the value of an independent evaluation being that we can sell ourselves down the road (when the Klamath Program is up for reauthorization). I would like to see an RFP developed, with some guidance from experts, so that we can get an independent evaluation.

**\*\*Motion\*\***(Kucera) An RFP be developed to seek evaluation on the Midprogram review from an out of basin (independent) entity and that a public comment period be provided when the mid program review is finalized.

**\*\*Seconded** (Spain)

#### Discussion

Spain: It's not so much important that it be out of basin as it is they be independent.

Kucera: I was thinking of, for example, an entity (college) from the Columbia Basin that deals with fish restoration issues.

Barnes: You need to define the difference between what Rob and John are asking for and this evaluation.

Dutra: The difference is between how the money was spent (what Rob and John have done) and an evaluation. The evaluation will give us the documentation to serve as a basis for a mid-course correction, if needed.

Barnes: So you are talking about limiting his (Rob's) analysis work to what he has already done?

Dutra: No. Rob would do the other analysis of matching funds and leveraging.

Grover: We've talked about fleshing out where the money was spent (matching funds and leveraging) and a re-presentation of Rob's data.

Barnes: But not the criteria that Hamilton went through on the board; like Habitat Condition criteria, etc. that would be in the RFP?

Grover: If I understand the motion, that would be fleshed out as part of the RFP. We would ask someone to make a proposal to us.

Kucera: The Motion is: (he repeated the Motion).

#### Discussion

Farro: I am in favor of the Motion. More than 10 years ago some on the coast were asking for oversight of Trinity program. At that time it was resisted severely and had it been undertaken at that time they probably wouldn't find themselves in the position they are right now trying to get the program re-authorized. It's really critical that we do this and make mid course adjustments if that is what is identified with this process.

Bienz: Would the evaluation be paid for out of 1997 funds? Would it be a priority or would it go through ranking process as all other RFP come through?

Kucera: I would like to see it be a priority as soon as funds are available.

Grover: It would go to TF because they have ultimate say on RFP. The Chair does have authority to appoint a committee. If the motion passes, the Chair will appoint a mid program evaluation committee.

Dutra: There is a difference between accounting and an evaluation.

Farro: Beachler's work should be considered as an accounting and a basis for evaluation.

Bienz: Would this evaluation go through a ranking process or be independent?

Grover: If the TF endorses it, it should be at the top of the heap. It should be independent of RFP process.

Bienz: What if the proposal comes back with a price tag of \$150,000?

Grover: There has to be some expectation that the sky cannot be the limit; this budget development for a mid program review would be part of the job of the committee.

Kucera: The process should include a public review and comment period once the mid program review was completed.

Spain: I would like public comments on the criteria themselves.

Rode: The criteria should be left to the committee.

Grover: There is a built-in public comment period in our process. Let's leave the subcommittee to develop the RFP and criteria, with public input.

**\*\*Motion amended\*\*** (Kucera) An RFP be developed to seek mid-program evaluation from an independent entity.

**\*\*Seconded\*\*** Dutra

**\*\*Motion passes.**

Grover: Do we have any volunteers to serve on a committee to scope and develop an RFP for the mid-program evaluation?

I will take these names under advisement for a Committee: Wilkinson, Halstead, Bob Rohde (volunteered by Hillman), and Dave Zepponi.

Recess

OCTOBER 27

Kieth Wilkinson now present

8:00 AM Reconvene

21. Restoration award to private landowners (Bulfinch)

Bulfinch: The Chair asked that we develop an award for the restoration program. The award would be for either or both an individual and an organization. Enclosed in your package is a proposed news release soliciting nominations (Handout N). There is also a certificate of appreciation for nominees not selected for the award and a logo. We have written permission to use this logo if we so desire. The Certificates we get at a cost of nothing. If TF approves the release and Certificate, we will proceed with the program.

**\*\*Motion.** The TF approve the press release and certificate as proposed.

**\*\*Seconded** (Webster)

22. TF Discussion

## Discussion

Hillman: In the second paragraph in first sentence, is there a reason why it talks about citizens, organizations and individuals on private land? Is it limited to private lands only?

Bulfinch: No this was not the intent. To address your concern we can rewrite this to leave the private lands out of that sentence, will that do it?

Hillman: Yes

**\*\*Motion amended\*\*** The TF approve the press release as proposed with the words "on private lands" deleted from the first sentence of the second paragraph.

**\*\*Accepted by second (Webster)**

## 23. Public Comment

No public comment

## 24. Action: TF decision on how to proceed with an award to private landowners

**\*\*\*Motion passes\*\***

## 25-28. TF Priorities with Limited Budget (Grover/Hall)

Grover: I'm not sure precisely what was intended by this agenda item. The budget appropriation is not signed by president yet. There should be no less than \$920,000 available to the TF for FY 1996. Dale Hall is working on trying to get that up to a million.

## 11. Action: TF decision on TWG Recommendations

Grover: We had a tabled agenda item that concerns appropriations that remain in 1996. Do you have a response, Rod?

Kucera: We did meet and had a constructive dialogue but, Klamath County still feels that we need better information and communication to make an informed decision on this issue and I cannot currently support this. My recommendation is that we take this back to the TWG. Craig Bienz offered to work with Klamath County representatives to work through the issues. The Motion as it stands is still not accepted.

**\*\*Motion\*\***(Spain) Funding issue be referred back to TWG for further action.

**\*\*Second\*\*** (Kucera)

## Discussion

Dutra: Are we referring back to both \$50k (Water Quality Model) and the \$20K (to increase scope of work with UCDavis)?

Spain: Both of those items. I do not intend to limit discussion on the MOU'S. But the MOU is a separate issue.

Webster: How will that affect NBS, will they wait?

Campbell: NBS accepts a short delay. If the delay is until the next TF Meeting in January, this is not acceptable. We must resolve this in a much shorter time.

Webster: Craig, can you work this out or is this a waste of time?

Bienz: We had a frank discussion last night about some of the problems created through lack of communication. Speaking for Klamath County, there was a concern that there was information that was not made available to them. It's possible there is a philosophical difference in the approach to the science. I think we can address those differences and come to solution. I am speaking for myself and Klamath County.

Webster: What is the time frame?

Bienz: The time frame is what we need to figure out here. From my perspective, Let's do this as soon as is necessary. It is important that we resolve this and have NBS expertise and money.

Grover: So you believe the differences are technical and not philosophical?

Bienz: That is what I believe, I would defer to Klamath County.

Kucera: Klamath County has always supported a flow study. It is with the technical aspect of how this is done that we have concerns: I defer to Zepponi.

Zepponi: I believe that we can resolve whether these are philosophical or technical differences in a short time frame, one that meets NBS' needs. I would implore the TF to take that course of action.

Hillman: I am not as optimistic that differences can be resolved. These may not be superficial issues here. This is the third meeting that Klamath County has voiced opposition. NBS is waiting. I don't think we should leave this room without direction from the TF moving the flow study effort forward.

Franklin: I believe there is an opportunity for the TF to give direction to TWG, working in cooperation with NBS to move forward to address details to resolve lingering issues. The issue of the wording in the water quality issue that is a proposal to the group, to me it is a minor point. A major point is to see NBS disappear when they are bringing a 4:1 cost share to us and they also represent a unique expertise. They provide excellent scientific assistance and we are supposed to be pursuing the best. Our job at this table is to restore anadromous fish. I cannot support the Motion on the table because of those thoughts.

Spain: Would you abstain?

Franklin: I will not abstain.

Spain: What arose out of the discussion last night was that there were meetings in which the TWG went over these programs in detail but for schedule conflict reasons, key Klamath County people were not able to attend. It's no one's fault but that's the reality and result. We felt that if we send it back to the TWG we have a shot at getting it resolved. If we do not do that, its dead in the water here today.

Franklin: I am suggesting it should go back to TWG, but we say get to it and address these issues. There has been only one meeting that has not been attended by a key technical person. We are not at an impasse in terms of technical discussion. For the TF to say go ahead and make sure peoples needs are accommodated, is to move more quickly in the direction we must go, not end up dead in the water.

Kucera: At the meeting before the last TWG meeting, some of these concerns were raised and not listened to; as you know its a majority vote.

Franklin: Can you clarify?

Kucera: I will defer to Zeponni on this point.

Grover: The Chair recognizes Dave Zeponni.

Zeponni: I did bring up the point at the Medford (July 25-26, 1995) meeting that Klamath County had concerns about the direction. We want clarification; it doesn't need to take until the next TF meeting. Give us a little time to sit down, maybe you can join us. We need to better articulate concerns and have them addressed point by point. We need our technical person to do this. We think this is a good motion.

Franklin: There are a host of concerns we all have, but I can't recall what Klamath County voted against. Please tell me.

Zeponni: Sharon had asked if we should or shouldn't go forward with this. My statement was that I didn't feel comfortable; we knew that we had the letter from Dave Solem in opposition, and Dutra wrote a letter as well. There were concerns that needed to be addressed. That's the point, not so much that there was a vote, but that there was a concern over these studies.

Franklin: If you can't be more specific as to what your concerns are, I can't stay with you. Tell me why they can't be handled in the TWG? What are the issues?

Zeponni: There is a question of financial costs, whose is paying for the studies.

I want to look at whole budget and specific cost to the project. \$50k is to be spent by the Klamath project, plus \$50k of the TF's money. Dave Solem has concerns about the study design. I can't speak to those. With the amount of money we're spending, I don't think a little time will kill this issue.



Franklin: Unless NBS goes away.

Rode: Remeeting won't resolve the cost issues. NBS, the experts, came to us with those figures. Does anyone who was at the meetings feel differently?

Spain: For Robert, there is a letter in the package raising the specific issues they have (Handout G, Klamath Irrigation District Letter). My understanding is that some concerns on the two issues before us were not addressed.

Franklin: Does this address your concerns, Rod?

Kucera: You would have to consult with Mr. Solem for specifics. I talked with him a week ago. Mr. Solem can be part of these discussions with the TWG; hopefully they can be resolved. We're talking about two weeks.

Franklin: (to Campbell) Has NBS generated a scope of work with greater detail? Because this is sticking point.

Campbell: We have not developed a specific scope of work for IFIM. That micro habitat work has been delegated to a subcommittee at the meeting. That work is in progress and is part of an overall systems analysis model which has been proposed.

Franklin: We are trying to generate a partnership that includes NBS with due input from all sides. In terms of what exactly what you will do, it's unclear at this time.

Campbell: That's correct, although it is our plan to develop preliminary study plans available for review by December. These will be circulated for review, input, and comment. The final plans for FY96 will be finalized about the time of the TF meeting in January. It our plan that whatever it will take to build a cooperative effort for a flow model will take place between now and December.

Franklin: In Solem's letter, it says " There is no clear course of action on the flow study, and until there is I vote no". I hope we are not in this situation for long. You can make this charge far into the process. We have an opportunity now to join forces with NBS and commence with studies, or we will lose them, or this TF will not conduct the studies and someone else will. It won't be this dynamic. I have watched NBS sour on this project. They could go somewhere else where they can do their research; I will be very displeased if they drop away. There are a bunch of resources they bring to the table we will have to struggle to marshal otherwise. I do not see this as a Technical problem. I see it as the work of the TF to define what process the TWG will use to iron out these criticisms of an approach we've embarked upon.

Grover: The Chair would like to recognize Leaf Hillman and letter he passed out. Please summarize.

Hillman: There has been continued direction to delay this flow study. If these delays come from concerns of model design, then NBS and the TWG should

work through it. The TWG is competent. The heart of the issue is not the TWG. The heart of the issue is the people around this table. This TF was created by Congress to restore anadromous fish, that's our charge. Along with that, every individual here should be committed to this end. At the last meeting in Klamath Falls, we were told by the Chair that the DOI Secretary is committed, and desires to see a commitment in terms of dollars. This TF did that; it wasn't easy, but we moved forward. That was, in my estimation, a commitment for NBS and the Secretary. Everyone knows that fundamental to this goal is an instream flow study. Not only do we have a charge, we were told that if we remained at an impasse that the Chair would exercise his prerogative and move this forward. I have never been an advocate of this approach, but in this case the Chair does not have any other choice. I'm not saying that there are details that don't have to be looked at. We cannot allow continual roadblocks to be thrown into this process. This will probably be only time I advocate this approach. I don't like it, but I don't see a choice. There has been a good faith effort on behalf of the TF.

Grover: Can you support the motion?

Hillman: No. For the historical record, at the TWG meeting, Mr. Solem couldn't commit to the flow study even though his representative, Mr. Keith Marine, is listed as supporting the TWG recommendations being forwarded to the TF in Klamath Falls. We can have another meeting, send this back to the TWG, but we'll be in the same situation at the next meeting. There is no passing the buck now; the decision is really here and now with the TF.

#### Public Comment

Clifton McMillan (Klamath County Board of Commissioners, Chair): Leaf has brought issues to the table that are fairly minor in a technical sense that we feel need to be resolved. Unfortunately, the situation from Klamath County's view, has not tended to diminish. Recent actions by the FWS in their aspiration to spend huge sums of money 's out of those directed from Senator Hatfield toward eco projects in the upper basin has exacerbated opposition to enter into flow studies. The financial implications were that the costs would be born out Klamath Project user's as those costs were capitalized. That's where the \$50k would come from. Am I wrong Robert?

Franklin: I would be amazed if that were true.

Clifton: Dave (Zepponi) you would have some more insights as to how that accounting is billed back against the project. But this is still a minor issue. Tuesday night we were essentially asked to contribute \$500k to this project. This \$50k is small change next to what we in the upper basin we were asked to contribute.

Franklin: I'm sorry, who is the we?

Clifton: It's funds appropriated by Senator Hatfield in the budget to Interior to FWS to the ERO in Klamath Falls specifically targeted (1.225M\$) for restoration projects on the ground in the upper basin. The Hatfield group is being asked to forgive \$500k of that would be directed toward the flow study

in the Klamath mainstem. I agree, the study needs to be done and the fish need to be restored, but at what cost and to whom? With that proposal afoot, the cost is too great to citizens of Klamath County in terms of thwarting their ability to do upstream beneficial projects.

Zeponi: I want to point out that the letter Dave Solem signed is from the Klamath Irrigation District, not Klamath County. He's made a concerted effort to distinguish between the two. In fact, on the ad hoc committee on the Upper Basin Amendment, he has always made the point that the draft has to go back to the Commissioner's for approval.

Wilkinson: Mr. Zeponi, do you support the motion on the table?

Zeponi: Yes, I believe, Leaf and Robert, that we can resolve the issue in short order. We are so close to a consensus, we do need to give it a chance. The ramifications of a directive from the Chair can be severe. I don't want to see this, like Leaf. Again, we'll put in the process that it is a short time line; it won't take until the next TF meeting. I was talking with NBS, I think they would stay with us until we talked. It's important for us to understand how this will all shake out. We need to have that little bit more time.

Spain: Tribal representative that have concerns, I urge you to have amendment to my motion, or a substitute so we can get this referred to the TWG.

Bulfinch: To remove ambiguities regarding the time frame, we need a firm deadline. We have gone three years with "a little longer, another meeting, etc." We must have a deadline in the immediate near future, no later than 30 days.

Spain: I will so amend the motion.

Webster: I don't see any guarantee that at the end of 30 days we won't be in the same position we're in now.

\*\*Motion amended: To refer the issues for both studies back to the TWG to be worked out within 30 days.

\*\*Amendment Accepted by Second

\*\*Motion fails (No: Hillman, Franklin, Webster; Bulfinch abstains)

Grover: The Secretary of the Interior is directed by P.L. 99-552 to develop and implement a program to restore the anadromous fishery resources and their habitats in California's Klamath River. The Act also establishes the multi-entity Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force (Task Force) to advise the Secretary in conducting this restoration effort. The Task Force, in conducting its business, prepared a comprehensive restoration plan to identify and guide the priority activities to accomplish needed restoration measures. One of these measures, debated at the October 26-27, 1995, meeting of the Task Force, would make available \$50,000 to cost share a critical component of a flow study in the Klamath River. The BOR, the National Biological Service, and likely the Pacific Power and Light Corporation would contribute additional

fiscal or leadership as well as expertise in conducting a system water quantity model essential to making informed decisions to restore the important anadromous fishes in the Klamath River. Failure to provide a consensus Task Force recommendation by a single vote does not serve the resource targeted for restoration nor the best interests of Interior agencies involved. It does not meet Interior's Trust responsibility to Native Americans nor address the economic needs of the many fishers dependent upon a viable restored salmon resource. I am, therefore, making \$50,000 from the funding available to the Klamath River Basin Fishery Restoration Program to proceed with a system analysis model for the phase II flow studies on the Klamath River from Keno Dam to Seiad USGS gauge.

Since much of the work of the Klamath Task Force is accomplished through its representatives on a Technical Work Group (TWG), I urge the Klamath County representative to fully participate in this forum and ensure that its TWG member attends the work sessions so important in advancing the goals of the Restoration Plan.

This is the position I am taking consistent with the chairman's advise and my responsibility as the Secretary's representative.

Dutra: Can I have a copy of that statement as soon as possible, because I highly object to it and I want to fax a copy to my representative. This is a high handed, low blow because one no vote in the consensus process means no. I am sure that I would have voted no under a different voting system and have voted to sent it back to the TWG to iron out the differences. We have to have a comfort level with things we support. This is just another reason why Secretary Babbitt should be replaced.

Grover: I understand your remarks. Understanding that the body of the TF is advisory in nature, and given the degree of impasse that we have had, it is in the best interest of this program that we go forward.

Webster: Has the TF ever voted on a flow study?

Grover: Yes. We're into Phase II now.

Hillman: Yes, it has come up as a specific issue.

Grover: TWG does not disappear as a result of this statement. There is still the opportunity to work with the TWG, and I suggest you all do that to fine tune the measures that are necessary. The TF agreed yesterday that we would receive the comments on the MOU with the NBS. If you'll get those comments in we'll make the program forthwith. Any TF member wish to discuss this issue any further?

Spain: I also request a copy. Does this statement refer to both studies?

Grover: I am referring to only the \$50,000 for the water model.

Bienz: In the absence of funding for expansion of the UCDavis proposal, there remains \$20,777 from the FY96 monies which has not been allocated. Going down

our TWG list of recommendations, we have seen great difficulties getting agreement on the water quality studies. The next on the list is an expansion of the videography for the cold water refugial study. Given this I would like to consider expansion of the contract for the cold water refugial habitat study. We wouldn't be able to complete it, but could conduct it as a phase of the pilot study.

\*\*Motion (Bienz) Expend the remaining FY96 funds (\$20,777) to add a videography component to the cold water refugia habitat study that we approved yesterday.

\*\*Seconded (Spain).

#### Discussion

Bulfinch: It would be advantageous and may assist in establishing priorities for further habitat restoration work. It would buttress the efforts already underway.

\*\*Motion passes (ODFW abstains)

#### 34. Report Entitled Toxic Water: A Report on the Adverse Effects of Pesticides on Pacific Coho Salmon and the Prevalence of Pesticides in Coho Habitat (Spain)

Spain: You have a copy of the report entitled Toxic Water: A Report on the Adverse Effects of Pesticides on Pacific Coho Salmon and the Prevalence of Pesticides in Coho Habitat (Handout Q). This is a growing concern. The Northwest Coalition for Alternatives to Pesticides (NCATP) is an advocacy group, but they tend to be very science based group; a lot of scientists work with the organization. They have compiled this from existing studies, the first such summary of impacts to salmon from pesticides and herbicides to my knowledge. It is under very serious consideration by Oregon Board of Forestry as they review and revise their own forest practices. It is before the habitat committee of the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) and will most likely come to the Council itself. Various other agencies are reviewing this to ascertain whether the concerns are sound. (Mr. Spain summarized the document). This report needs serious consideration in the future by this TF. We need to monitor how these agencies react to this report to determine whether there are serious concerns here, and, if so, how this report can be worked into the TF process.

#### Discussion

Grover: Do you request any other action by TF members?

Spain: No, not at this time. My recommendation would be to monitor this and report back in six months to the TF.

Wilkinson: I would broaden the issue that Mr. Spain has put on the table. Under the potential for listing of coho, the question is now arising as to what will the prescription for recovery look like? From my part of the world,

where we have watershed associations and other organizations to address these issues, typically money is the biggest hurdle to get projects in the field. Where can we best spend money to head listing off? NMFS has been very supportive and will confer on anything our groups are doing, but we need a design so that groups can make a long term investment in recovery programs. They are handcuffed right now.

No further questions; no TF action.

30. CDFG Report on 1995 In River Sport Fishery and Preliminary Fall Spawner Escapement for the Klamath River Basin and date for hatchery vs. natural fish forum (Mike Rode)

Mike Rode provided an update of information that went to the Klamath Fishery Management Council (KC) meeting a couple of weeks ago (Handout P).

Questions:

Wilkinson: How does coho return compare with last year?

Rode: My recollection is that it was negligible. The expanded figure for harvest is 80 fish. Unfortunately, many of our weirs shut down before coho come in.

Wilkinson: The reason I ask is everyone on the coast wants to know.

Rode: Some other observations: the adults have been in excellent condition; grilse are larger this year than in 1994; we may be having catch & release problems at the estuary.

Webster: Our biologist saw 100 dead fish on the beach down there in one day.

Rode: Coho returns are up slightly, but we're talking about small numbers. Adult steelhead returns are about one half of last year. Everyone is getting excited about these returns being up, but it is one point in time; this doesn't tell the whole story. Certainly salmon are not out of the hot water yet, so to speak.

Franklin: We wouldn't really see half-pounders showing up in these counts because of capture limitations at the weirs, right?

Rode: Correct. Weirs are actually set up to count salmon. For the complete count at the Shasta Racks, right now its the third highest run in the last 20 years.

Hillman: On the numbers you are seeing at Bogus Creek, are we experiencing straying in Bogus?

Rode: We're probably experiencing lots of straying in Bogus Creek, the mouth is only 30 feet from the hatchery.

Wilkinson: What is steelhead egg take goal? Are they meeting it?

Rode: Around 500,000. They are not meeting it and haven't for three or four years. They haven't met the coho egg take goal for several years either.

Franklin: There is a proposal to reopen sport fishing on the Trinity River, (I am not sure what the downstream point is, Douglas City Bridge, something like that) right near the hatchery and the dam. The Tribe has some real concerns that if that were to happen. We see actually in that reach, some mixture, some unknown mixture of hatchery fish and others. Potentially there would be impacts to the natural component of the run.

Barnes: I believe the request was made by the Trinity County Supervisors to open up the fishery to Governor's office. The Governor has apparently already denied the request.

Rode: I don't think this was a request for permanent regulation changes to allow fishing on a year to year basis. I think it was another one of those, hey, we got this excess number of fish at the hatchery, can't we get in there and harvest a few?

Franklin: There seems to be some contrast between what has been done by the department to open a fishery above I-5 on the Klamath River and the position the Governor's office apparently had taken regarding a similar request on the Trinity.

Rode: First of all, on the Trinity decision, the Department recommended against opening that based on the fact that we thought that the natural spawning within that reach of river was substantially greater than that which occurs up in the reach above I-5 on the Klamath River. Since the quotas are based on protecting natural stocks, once those fish get up above I-5, we think that an overwhelmingly large proportion are hatchery bound so that the harm is very minimal in terms of the fish that are harvested versus the potential for harm on the Trinity side. As far as the KC and the PFMC, those regulations are the responsibility of the State Fish and Game Commission and they are written in the angling regulations in terms of the situation on the Klamath above I-5.

Franklin: On Hoopa Valley Reservation, this year, our fishers became well aware that there were a lot more fish than were projected. People who were on the water, we all saw it and we knew that we could have had a larger number of fish allocated to us. We are in a position where people are very uncomfortable that some other group has been given an opportunity to take advantage of that situation for whatever reason biologically. To see sport fishers given some advantage is vexing.

Rode: I am aware of it and I am sensitive to everything you have just said. I see it as a byproduct of the uncertainty that is inherent in our predictions for the next year's population numbers from which we derive our harvest quotas. I wish opportunities could have been provided for in-river and ocean sports fishermen as well as the commercial fishing industry along with the tribal fishermen downstream, but they are passed once fish get up to that upper part of the river. The way our system is set up, we don't have

escapement numbers until those fish get to the hatchery and to the various counting facilities. I don't have an answer for you right now.

Franklin: We shut our fishery down fundamentally because we recognized that to continue to fish even if there were more fish than the pre-season estimates indicated, we have the potential to impact wild fish that are swimming up the river through the Reservation and we are not willing to do that in search of an opportunity to take advantage of an abundance that was there. Thank you.

Barnes: I just wanted to point out to the Task Force (TF) that it was an opportunity foregone this year to find out what the hatchery contribution was above I-5. We should be thinking about it for next year.

Rode: Right and I think we ought to keep in mind that opportunity. That would provide us with valuable data and an additional source of information for evaluating hatchery impacts. I agree strongly. What I wanted to do also was to mention that I would like to organize some sort of a hatchery natural stock interaction forum and I think it might be appropriate to have one other person to co-develop this with me and I am asking for one of the TF members to volunteer, maybe one of the downstream interests to help put this together. I don't think it is appropriate to pick a date now but what we need to do is to get together, invite the appropriate people, try to air all these concerns, and see if we can come up with something that might result in a change in the production guidelines and constraints.

Webster: I can get some staff to come to that.

Barnes: I would like to take off my TF hat that I am wearing as an alternate and put on my hat as a chairman of the Technical Advisory Team for the KC to say we would like to be involved in that.

Rode: I think you would be a very appropriate person to have on that.

Wilkinson: That's what I think.

Barnes: Yes, Keith is a candidate also since he is a member of the KC. So this would be focused toward getting a policy on hatchery fish?

Rode: I would like it to be a completely open forum. I would like us to look at the issues, to see whether or not there are any data needs. Do we have enough data and information now to propose some changes? I just want to look at this with open minds and see what we come up with. We know what all the issues are. I would like to lay them out and cover them one by one.

Grover (speaking for Halstead): Yes, FWS would also participate in this forum.

Rode: Okay, so then the four of us could put something together and I am kind of looking at when things slow down a little bit, sometime in the winter.

Ellinwood: Mike, I realize that you haven't been on the TWG (TWG) for this TF very long and I would suggest that if the TF does address this issue, they



keep in mind that the TWG did conduct a review of capturing practices and interaction between wild fish versus propagated fish back in 1994. A revisit of the Minutes of those activities would be helpful.

Rode: There was also an accompanying report.

Ellinwood: That is correct and the CDFG also conducted a complete review as you are aware of in 1992 and with the subsequent development of guidelines in 1993 in reference specifically to the issue that Bob has raised. Tim Farly remarked to me last week that the Department is now willing to review those guidelines and possibly revise.

Rode: Right, I am very familiar with that, it was a May 1993 report that evaluated hatcheries in the basin, both Trinity River and Iron Gate Hatcheries and I don't want to redo that. I don't want to get into every little item of business that the hatcheries are involved with. I think we have got some major issues and I would like to concentrate on those. I would like to look at this as an advisory group to the Department. We recognize that it is our responsibility to run those hatcheries. We also recognize the expertise in this group and in the associations that this group has, so I would like it to be a direct response to the Department.

Grover: Like all good business, I hope that you would bring whatever product that you have back to the TF. We can decide then whether we make a recommendation to the Department or whatever any other action that we may wish to take.

Hillman: I would point out to Mike the fact that since the Department or the Commission chose to open that fishery above I-5, then it would seem like it would also be the Department's responsibility to assess the impact on wild populations of that fishery and that burden of responsibility shouldn't be put back on this TF.

29. Report on Revision of Request for Proposals and Proposal Ranking Process  
(Jud Ellinwood)

Ellinwood: The report that I am going to present (Handout O) is in response to the TF's instruction to review the RFP proposal evaluation criteria. The TWG initiated a review process that not only examines the criteria but also focuses on the process in general. The decision to expand the scope for the review was made in order to give the TF full benefit of the TWG's familiarity with the functions of the process and the functional problems that they are aware of. The TWG's review activities have so far consisted of identification of perceived problems, possible solutions, and construction of a framework for development of findings and recommended solutions. A list of the problems and possible solutions are attached to your report. It is the TWG's intention to use TF responses to this report to guide its development of a final set of findings and recommendations that will be presented to the TF at its next meeting. There are three recommendations that we would like to make. Our first recommendation is in regard to a review and revision framework. In an analysis of the potential solutions, we initially identified suggested that a comprehensive review and revision of the RFP process will require changes in

four broad areas. The areas we identify are planning, program policies, RFP, its content and process, and the annual budget development. These four categories form the framework we recommend the TF use to guide and provide a structure for RFP review discussions and the development of specific action recommendations. Our second recommendation is in regard to the review and revision of the time line. It is our belief that the TWG and the TF working together in a coordinated and cooperative effort can and should complete a comprehensive revision of the RFP process by December 31, 1996. It is the opinion of the TWG that review and revision of the RFP process should be a top priority of the TWG. Because this task will likely consume a substantial part if not the majority of the time we will be able to devote to TWG work over the next year, we would like to obtain TF concurrence on this proposed time line and permission to commit our time and resources to this task on an as needed basis. Our third recommendation is in regards to the interim proposal evaluation and funding allocation process. We wish to convey to the TF our strong concern that the basis for the programs FY97 funding allocation process will be an objective evaluation and ranking system that is not compromised by decisions that favor advocacy of individual projects over protecting the integrity of the process. For our part, the TWG is committed to developing and implementing as many RFP process review recommendations as is possible prior to allocation of the FY97 funding. In regards to the RFP itself, it is realistic to expect some but not all needed changes will be made before it is distributed to the public. This year's RFP will likely represent an intermediate stage of development between the current version and what we would ideally like it to be. To avoid the conflict you experienced during funding allocation this past summer, we respectfully suggest that over the next several months, the TF give due consideration to reaching consensus agreement on the following fundamental funding allocation process components: #1) Proposals will be evaluated with a set of interim criteria developed by the TWG. #2) Proposals will be scored and ranked by score and, most importantly, #3) The TF will award funding to proposals with no exceptions in order of rank. This does not mean that the TF cannot or shouldn't set predetermined spending ceilings on categories of projects that reflect the fiscal year's spending priorities. To make such a process work, the TWG would presumably rank projects within each category and the TF would allocate funding by rank within each category up to the established ceiling amount. One example of project categorization would place proposals in one of the following three categories: The first category, education projects, fish habitat protection and restoration construction projects and enhancement projects. The second category of planning projects and a third category, all other projects. In conclusion, what is essential is that the TF agree upon a process before proposals are evaluated and then apply it without exception. Thank you.

Franklin: I would just like to make a comment. I would like to thank Jud for his work and the others involved for their work. There are very few people that I have encountered that do better work than Jud Ellinwood.

Ellinwood: Thank you, Bob. I would like to point out that I think it would be helpful if the TF is in a position to do so to approve the framework that we presented today in order to allow us to move forward with a common frame for discussions that will follow.

Grover: Okay, as this is a work in progress, you are looking for the feedback from the TF members on not only the content but at least conceptual agreement over the framework that you presented here?

Ellinwood: That is correct.

Wilkinson: Jud, would you be open then to input as to a revisit of the TWG membership?

Ellinwood: Sure. I think that would be very consistent with policies.

Barnes: I attended the TF meeting when the final decisions were made on the budget process. There were considerable changes that were made in the recommended projects that were originally funded; changes from the TWG recommendations. So what is meant by the last statement, it says "Essentially the TF agreed upon the process". Does that take away the authority of the TF to change the ranking process?

Ellinwood: The only thing that I am referring to there is if you go into a process with agreement on how you are going to conduct it, then you maintain the integrity of that process. If the integrity of the process is important enough to the TF, then they need to be taking some pro-active steps to assure themselves that this is the right process that you want to use once the decisions start being made. I would like to reemphasize we are really looking for TF input to our review process to fill out these lists to identify any gaps. Several of the solutions that we have so far identified, address precisely this issue. For instance, the idea of categorization. Right now, all projects are lumped together. We think there are apples and oranges. We think that there are certain priorities the TF has for research. We think there are certain priorities that we have for implementation and et cetera. I think that up until now, because there has been no explicit agreement going into proposal ranking process and subsequent allocation of funds, people have had individual ideas of what those priorities are. Conflict arises once those priorities surface when people are talking about how the money is going to be awarded. If the TF hypothetically had decided that the flow study was the preeminent funding project for the year, they would have stated that automatically and that amount of money would have just been taken off the top leaving a balance amount to be distributed amongst the rest of the proposals. Within those proposals, there may have been specific research priorities that this group could have agreed on and by the same token, certain restoration priorities that they could have agreed upon. Had there been a set of categories with spending ceilings attached to them, it would have been very easy to simply go down a ranked list within those categories and fund. But none of this has really happened so far. It has been implied that it needs to be done, it is obvious that it needs to be done, but it has not been done so far. So we are simply going to articulate those ideas in our recommendations.

Hamilton: Jud, the TF meeting where they decided on the budget is traditionally done in June. When you work back from June, the month before TWG gets together and ranks the proposals. If you work back from that, the RFP has to be out 6 weeks, and staff needs a couple weeks prior to that to get the projects bundled and mail them to each individual TWG member so that they

can rank them. Our staff needs to get this process in gear before February 15th to meet the June TF meeting deadline. Will what you envision here allow us to come up with an RFP that is in place to go out prior to the 15th of February?

Ellinwood: Yes, and with the changes that could be made this year as far as what I was just talking about, that would be relatively simple. Policy decisions would be made by the TF and instead of back loading discussion about budget after the evaluation process is already in motion. The budget decisions should be done before the projects are evaluated and ranked and that would be very simple to do. **{It should be noted that at one time the TF did rank projects by category and that at the June 15-17, 1992 meeting the TWG recommended that the TF fund projects by absolute rank and abandon this process: see Minutes.}** Traditionally, the Budget Committee has met after the TWG has ranked the projects and then the last action is the TF acting on the recommendations of the Budget Committee and the TWG. What I am saying is the Budget Committee ought to be meeting before the TWG does the ranking and the TF should reach agreement on how that money is going to be spent.

Hamilton: When the RFP goes out, we state in the RFP what the ranking criteria are. We always have. So that would have to be agreed on, too, then before February 15th.

Ellinwood: That is correct. Our attempt is to do at least some revision of criteria in time to get them included into this year's RFP with the recognition that there will probably be a substantial amount of further revision that takes place, not only in regards to the RFP itself, that is to say the content, but in these other areas as well and it is going to take awhile that is why we set a deadline or proposed a deadline of December 31, 1996.

Wilkinson: Mr. Chairman, to refresh your memory, at the KC meeting, this issue was put on the table and there was discussion concerning what may become policy issues in relationship to the product of the TWG. The discussion there centered about some forum, probably the Three Chairs addressing the issue. Now it appears with the proposal that is being presented that needs to be incorporated timewise. There are issues that need to be addressed and that the decision there was to have the three chairs take a look at it. There is some coordination that might need to be done here on the short term to schedule a three chairs meeting to address the KC's concerns.

Ellinwood: I think that would be helpful if we could arrange that because a lot of the criticism that has been leveled at this process has been directed at lack of communication and lack of listening to all of the concerns that are out there especially specific user groups. Central to this whole issue is the TWG's objectivity. If you go through the problem statements and the solutions that we have identified so far, objectivity comes up again and again. It is a major issue so we want to be able to access all of the criticisms that may be out there and, by the same token all recommend solutions that may be out there. We want to make this as inclusive a process as possible and we want to be sure that if the TWG has primary responsibility for developing recommendations, that we get full input from all the interested parties.

Grover: Let's make it an assignment to ourselves that we will see to it that we as TF members or our Technical representatives review this and get comments to the Chairman of the TWG with a "cc" to Jud by 12/1/95. I will see that the distribution and the same message is conveyed to the KC.

Franklin: What does the TF need to do toward directing the TWG to do in order to improve this year's process? I would assume that we will try to write an RFP that has a rational set of priorities with the information we have on hand.

Ellinwood: Correct, may I suggest to the TF that you may want to consider breaking the tradition of a June budget meeting if the TF wants to have an opportunity to take some action on making budget allocation decisions as far as setting priorities consistent with the kind of recommendations I was talking about earlier; you would have to be scheduling a meeting prior to the evaluation of projects so I would like to suggest for your consideration that you possibly entertain an April meeting.

Grover: One of the things that Chairman Hall mentioned last time was trying to keep these administrative costs under control. It costs a lot of money for the travel and we are trying to trim these areas.

Dutra: Are you suggesting we move it up, our normal June meeting.

Ellinwood: I am suggesting that if cost is a consideration, that you might want to consider the long term costs of another chaotic budget allocation meeting as opposed to the cost of travel and other expenses of an April meeting.

Grover: The advantage, aren't the proposals going to be out by then and going to the TWG for ranking. I mean, what be the input that would be so critical to have say an April meeting?

Ellinwood: The need is to establish spending priorities for the budget; to essentially set your budget ahead of time so that you know how much money you want to be spending for types of work or types of projects. There needs to be clarity and an agreement on a process and budget before these projects are presented to you in ranked shape.

Bienz: Jud, would it be possible to formulate those criteria before their January meeting. If the TWG get together ahead of that and tried to come up with those criteria?

Ellinwood: This is TF work. They need to be setting a budget for this program. It is not within the purview of the TWG to making those recommendations.

Grover: Is this something, in your opinion, could this be addressed in January?

Dutra: That is my opinion, you know, when we see the committee report and the alternatives that this possibility of a budget committee, various possibilities will be expanded on in the January meeting.

Grover: And I also would suspect at that time, if we come to some sort of impasse or have a great deal of information, we could in January establish the need for an April meeting to complete our business.

Ellinwood: Let's use the January meeting to find out exactly what it is going to take and if there is a need for meeting that you identify it then.

**\*\*Action\*\*** Grover: Let's make it an assignment to ourselves that we will see to it that we as TF members or our Technical representatives review this and get comments to the Chairman of the TWG with a "cc" to Jud by 12/1/95.

### 31. USFWS Klamath Ecoregion reorganization (Lewis)

Steve Lewis provided a presentation on the Services reorganization within Ecoregion boundaries.

#### Questions

Q (Franklin): Within our eco-region, in the past we have worked with the Trinity River Office Flow Evaluation Study Program through the ES. So now the line of authority goes up through you, Jerry?

A (Grover): There is a State Supervisor down there but basically, yes. Dale Hall is the ARD. That part of it hasn't changed.

Q (Franklin): So it is Dale, you, and Wayne White?

A (Grover): And then the actual field supervisors that are in the three offices in California. Joel Medlin heads up the Sacramento ES Office and we have one in Carlsbad and one in Ventura. We have suboffices out of there in Barstow and then at Weaverville.

Lewis: One of the things that the FWS was hoping is that by going through the Eco-region approach they'd do a better job of meeting their mandate of management of the resources and the mission that the FWS to conserve, protect and enhance the nation's fish and wildlife and their habitats for the continuing benefit of people. We are trying to put the emphasis on habitats.

Q (Franklin): We all think we are generally familiar with what an ecosystem is and what we might concern ourselves with if we are going to manage one. When it comes down to decision making, when it comes down to management recommendations, how do people in the FWS instruct themselves as to what the agency's real direction is? Where are written policies, handbooks, I want the written stuff that you, the FWS, use? I would like to have my hands on that stuff so that I can see what guidance there is.

Grover: There will be, Robert. There is an implementation strategy of the Service's mandates and directions that are being contained in the document. Here is a draft.

Lewis: Eventually, we will pick up most of all the Service responsibilities in this area as this office gets fully staffed but these are being coordinated again through the Portland office because all this is under Dale.

Franklin: So there is additional staff that is contemplated within?

Grover: No, it is a redirection of staff. For instance, vacancies that would occur for instance in Sacramento for a position that was working up in Klamath Basin, as that position became vacant, it would probably be reassigned to one of the offices in the Basin. So it is going to be a shifting of staff and a shifting of expertise. We are trying to put them on the ground where the work is.

Q (Franklin): Is the Lewiston office gone?

Grover: It is moved. Randy is still there and Zedonis. So they have just moved over to Weaverville to move to better quarters. The function is still there.

Q (Franklin): What are the FWS priorities?

Grover: Between the President and the Secretary, it has been made very clear for Pacific Region that the two things that we are going to address our resources to are implementing the President's Forest Plan and the issues that surround our responsibilities with the ESA.

Q (Dutra): I understand that there are new personnel being put into the Yreka Office to work on forest cuts. Can you enlighten me a little bit on that?

A (Grover): Organizationally, when the President's Forest Plan was accepted, a separate budget was provided. Additional personnel were made available to implement the President's Forest Plan with the direction that together with FWS for its responsibilities, the USFS and BLM would be working to implement that Plan. So Ron suddenly wears another hat. Part of it, he still oversees the TF, the administering of this program as well as the forest functions that are assigned to his office. There are similarly people that work out of the Arcata office as well as Steve's office.

#### COMMENTS:

Franklin: Unfortunately, we haven't all been in the vehicle together going down the road. FWS has a basic function in the DOI to provide biological expertise on the questions that pertain to management of resources. For instance, Klamath River flows. There is a fundamental relationship between that biological expertise and the protection of Tribal Trust resources such as the fishery in the Klamath River. FWS also in this forum must provide us with leadership that assists us meaningfully in restoring populations that are at low points and populations that are candidates for listing under the ESA. It

is the case that there are some real experts in the basin who have spent a great deal of time going to school, a great deal of time pursuing their professions. Many of them have spent years in this area developing specific expertise that pertains to Klamath River stream flows and frequently that brand of expertise resides in the offices in the Basin as opposed to in the District or Regional office or in the California State office. I think of excellent scientists such as Randy Brown who has been the FERC person that has worked on Klamath fisheries until very recently. He no longer does that for us in this basin and I am unhappy about that because he really represents the state of the art when it comes to FWS expertise in this basin on FERC issues. I think of excellent scientists like Joe Polos who is in Bruce Halstead's office and others. In the recent history of advice from the FWS to the Interior Secretary through BLM regarding Klamath River flows, most unfortunately, we have had individuals who have authored letters such as the one I am about to read an excerpt from, dated August 18 from Steve Lewis: "Iron Gate flows are important to the success of salmon survival and recovery. The Service supports the FERC license including that during periods of insufficient water conditions, flows can be less than the FERC license schedule, during periods when there is not sufficient water to meet mandated needs, water shortages should be shared by all users." I got a hold of this letter and I made an attempt to reconstruct the history that lead up to its creation. I am very displeased to report that this letter was generated in isolation from the very sources that we depend on for biological expertise on these matters. Randy Brown was not consulted. Others were not consulted. Written input was not taken advantage of. I am speaking to what I hope is not the pattern, but is certainly a history of failure of FWS to take advantage of its own information and bring that information forward to inform management decisions. I had hopes that the ERO that was established in Klamath Falls could act as a clearing house for information; a kind of a pivot point for information; a guide to basin wide research and perhaps some of that has been realized. The Hoopa Valley Tribe is not about to sit aside, observe what I have described and fail to make comment to the TF regarding this problem. Our TF Chairman, I am told, approved of the 18 August letter that I have read from. I am concerned that letters of this nature would be written without taking advantage of your own staff. I am concerned that letters of this nature would be written and address questions that are legal in nature and fail to take advantage of the Regional Solicitor's office and guidance they could provide. I hope never again to see an example where a policy statement would be developed by the FWS in the Klamath Eco-region in a similar fashion. I ascribe responsibility for this dysfunction to Dale Hall and I am sorry he is not here today to look at me while I tell him that. As trustee responsible to advise the Secretary on management of water resources in the Klamath River in a way that protects the fundamental Tribal resources, he failed in that instance. As Chairman of the TF charged with restoration of anadromous fisheries in this river, he failed in this instance. In approving a letter which is isolated from the best available scientific information that was and could have been provided by his own staff, something very unfortunate occurred.

Grover: Any questions of Steve? Further comments? Your comments are noted for the record, Bob.



Q (Wilkinson): Steve, could you verbalize to me in the Clinton Forest Plan how can we work those together with the Rogue drainage?

A: We do have some cross over. The other thing is we are working on jobs- in- the woods with the California CERT and with the Oregon CERT. What we need to do is to make sure that we come to you and tell you what we are doing as the PAC so that we keep your PAC informed and there will be more coordination.

Wilkinson: There are some issues that are coming up pretty soon that will require that.

### 32. Update of the Trinity Restoration Reauthorization

Grover: H.R. 2243 was introduced in August. It is my understanding that since it's introduction there has been committee staff work which has edited a lot of items within the draft bill. On November second there will be a hearing on the Trinity River Bill. It apparently will be moved to another subcommittee. There was a briefing yesterday for house staffers regarding this reauthorization. It will be clearer after the hearing as to what amendments will be proposed, and how it might change.

Franklin: What you have to take a look at is a current incarnation of a Bill. It has been much massaged by the House. It is not what was introduced by DOI and the Tribe. We are looking for reauthorization, but we have been visited by all kinds of amendments. In the hearing, Trinity County will describe this as an act of aggression, that's how much they like it.

Grover: I would expect that the Tribes will be to the forefront in providing testimony.

Franklin: We are testifying.

Grover: Something else which has bearing on the Trinity River and its water resources is H.R.1906, the Central Valley Reform Act of 1995. This went to a House mark this week. None of the comments provided by DOI were accepted. There were a number of amendments offered. One would direct the Secretary of Interior in implementing the Central Valley Act to comply with all State Water Policy Regulations. What was not clear was the resolution of the Trinity river water being diverted to the Central Valley. Mr. Doolittle noted in his verbal comments that this issue had not been resolved and that he was working with Congressman Riggs to try to reach resolution.

Franklin: In this case we have legislation which was originally introduced by Congressman Riggs (in his first term); language that was included in the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) that spoke to Trinity River stream flows both in the present and the future. The legislation that Congressman Riggs introduced and successfully carried through the process clarified rolls the Hoopa Valley Tribe and the DOI played in utilizing the enormous body of research that has been compiled regarding relationships between fish populations, flows, river health, and diversions away from the Trinity River. At this point we have Doolittle promoting changes to that section of the CVPIA that would take away local control, something the

Republican Congress is sworn to promote. We have Doolittle and his committee moving a decision away from DOI and taking the decision from a scientific arena to Congress, a decidedly political arena. This also flies in the face of the stated agenda of the new Republican House. And we have Congressman Riggs failing utterly to protect legislation which he himself promoted. I cannot inform you as to why Congressman Riggs is now doing this. Several of the TF entities have approached Mr. Riggs in an attempt to inform him that his district was benefitted by what he did previously and his district will be damaged very likely by amendments to that section. He has failed thus far to intervene with his colleague Doolittle. These are perilous times.

Grover: There has been a change of assignments; instead of the Trinity Reauthorization being in the Committee on Water and Science it will move to the Committee on Fish and Wildlife and Aquaculture, chaired by Congressman Saxton from New Jersey.

Spain: He should do a better job; coming from his District he is sensitive to fisheries issues.

(Update: it is anticipated that \$5M will be appropriated for the Trinity Restoration Reauthorization for FY96. Concurrently there is a reauthorization bill in House Committee.)

33. Summary and Action - Decision on date, location and agenda for the next two meetings

The next meeting will be January 29-30, 1996 in Klamath Falls. The meeting will start at noon on the 29th.

The meeting after next will be on June 4-5, 1996 in Eureka.

ADJOURNED

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING  
October 26-27, 1995

Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Members Present:

Kent Bulfinch	California In-River Sport Fishing Community
Jim Bybee	National Marine Fisheries Service
Clancy Dutra	Siskiyou County
Mitch Farro	Humboldt County
Dale Webster	Yurok Tribe
Jerry Grover	U. S. Department of the Interior
(for Dale Hall)	
Leaf Hillman	Karuk Tribe
Craig Bienz	Klamath Tribe
Jerry Barnes	U. S. Department of Agriculture
(for Al Olson)	
Robert Franklin	Hoopa Indian Tribe
(for Michael Orcutt)	
Michael Rode	California Department of Fish and Game
(for Randy Benthin)	
Glen Spain	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
(for Nat Bingham)	
Rod Kucera	Klamath County
(for David Solem)	
Keith Wilkinson	ODFW (2nd Day Only)

Attendees:

John Barthlow	National Biological Service
Craig Bienz	Natural Resources Dept., Klamath Tribe
Gary Black	Siskiyou RCD
Rob Boehler	Klamath Technical Work Group
Jim Bryant	U. S. Bureau of Reclamation
Sharon Campbell	National Biological Service
George Ellinwood	PCFFA
Dan Gale	Yurok Tribal Fisheries Program
Robert Franklin	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Bruce Halstead	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Arcata
Steve Lewis	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Klamath Falls
Cliff McMillan	Klamath County Board of Commerce
Tony Shaw	U. S. Forest Service
Dale Webster	Yurok Tribe
Jim Waldvogel	Klamath River Task Force/Technical Work Group
Dave Zepponi	Klamath Water Users Association
Frank Shrier	Pacific Power & Light

FINAL AGENDA FOR THE KLAMATH TASK FORCE MEETING  
BROOKINGS, OREGON  
OCTOBER 26-27, 1995

OCTOBER 26

- 8:00 AM      1. Convene. Opening remarks.
2. Adoption of agenda
3. Review of last meeting/subsequent correspondence (Hamilton)
- 8:30        4. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Jim Bryant)
- A. Status of
1. Lake Levels
2. Flows
3. Forecast
- B. Brief Report on Status of Long Term Klamath Project  
                 Operation Plan (KPOP)
- 8:50        5. NBS Jurisdictional Analysis (Campbell)
- 9:15        6. Task Force Discussion
- 9:40        7. Public Comment
- 10:00       Break
- 10:15       8. Flow Study Direction (Hall) and Technical Work Group (TWG)  
Recommendations for Instream Flow Study (Bienz)
- A. NBS letter July 7 and response (Hall)
- B. MOU (Campbell)
- C. Flow Study Direction (Bienz)
- D. Discretionary Funds (\$92k) and recommendation to TF
- E. TWG role in KPOP
- 11:00       9. Task Force Discussion
- 11:30       10. Public Comment
- 12:30       Lunch
- 1:30        11. Action: TF decision on TWG Recommendations
- 2:00        12. Progress Report on Reintroduction of Anadromous Fish into  
Upper Basin (Shrier)
- 2:30        13. Upper Basin Amendment Final Recommendation - (Upper Basin  
Amendment Ad-Hoc Committee, Keith Wilkinson)
- 2:50        14. Task Force Discussion
- 3:20        15. Public comment

3:45 16. Action: TF Decision on how to proceed with Upper Basin Amendment

4:30 17. Mid program review (Beachler/Hamilton)

4:45 18. TF Discussion

5:00 19. Public Comment

5:30 20. Action: TF Decision on how to proceed with Mid-Program Review

6:00 Recess

OCTOBER 27

8:00 AM Reconvene

8:05 21. Restoration award to private landowners (Bulfinch)

8:15 22. TF Discussion

8:30 23. Public Comment

9:00 24. Action: TF decision on how to proceed with an award to private landowners

9:15 25. TF Priorities with Limited Budget (Hall)

9:30 26. TF Discussion

9:45 27. Public Comment

10:00 28. TF decision on priorities

10:30 Break

11:00 29. Report on Revision of Request for Proposals and proposal ranking process (Ellinwood)

11:15 30. CDFG Report on 1995 Inriver Sport Fishery and Preliminary Fall Spawner Escapement for the Klamath River Basin (Rode) and date for hatchery vs. natural fish forum

11:45 31. USFWS Klamath Ecoregion reorganization (Lewis)

12:00 32. Update of Trinity Restoration Reauthorization (Tom Stokely)

12:00 pm 33. Summary and Action - Decide on date, location, and agenda for next TWO meetings - Adjourn

Task Force Meeting Handouts  
October 26-27, 1995

Agendum #3 Responses to past letters

Handout A. Letter from Bingham to Babbitt dated 8/28/95 regarding amendments to CVPIA and initial response.

Handout B. Response to Dale Hall's letter of July 24, 1995 requesting cooperative funding of study activities during FY96.

Information

Handout C. Letter from Klamath Forest Alliance to Hatfield, 9/24/95

Agen.#4 Handout D. Status Report from the Bureau of Reclamation

Agen.#8 Handout E. Request for policy statement on flow study from NBS and response

Handout F. Letter from Hall to Sharon Campbell.

Handout G. Letter to TF members requesting concurrence with TWG recommendations and Responses from California In-River Sport Fishing Community, Klamath County, Siskiyou County, and CDFG.

Handout H. Draft MOU, Attachment, and Diagram

Agen.#10 Handout I. Draft Minutes from October 10-11, 1995 TWG meeting

Agen.#12 Handout J. Progress Report on Reintroduction of Anadromous Fish into Upper Basin (Shrier)

Handout K. Pacific Corps Klamath River Hydro Projects

Agen.#13 Handout L. Draft Upper Basin Amendment

Agen.#17 Handout M. a. Klamath River Fishery Restoration Program Evaluation Report, Fiscal Years 1989-1992

b. Draft Information Sheet Klamath River fishery Restoration Evaluation Report

Agen.#21 Handout N. Proposed News Release

Agendum #29 Handout O. Request for Proposals Process Review  
Agendum #30 Handout P. CDFG Report on 1995 in-river Sport Fishery  
Agendum #34 Handout Q. Report on Adverse Effects fo Pesticides

\*\*\*\*\*

Glossary of acronyms used in the Task Force Minutes:

1. Bureau of Reclamation - BOR
2. Irongate Dam - IGD
3. Technical Work Group - TWG
4. Task Force - TF
5. California Department of Fish and Game - CDFG
6. Ecosystem Restoration Office - ERO
7. National Marine Fisheries Service - NMFS
8. Klamath Basin Water Users - KBWU
9. National Biological Survey - NBS
10. Pacific Power and Light - PPL
11. Coded Wire Tags - CWT
12. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission - FERC
13. U.S. Department of Agriculture - USDA
14. U.S. Geological Survey - USGS
15. Upper Basin Amendment - UBA
16. Resource Conservation District - RCD
17. U. S. Department of Interior - DOI
18. Memorandum of Understanding - MOU